



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,078	11/05/2003	Volker Kamm	038724.52864US	6297
23911	7590	05/02/2006		
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			EXAMINER CHAUDHRY, SAEED T	
			ART UNIT 1746	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/701,078	KAMM, VOLKER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saeed T. Chaudhry	1746	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-26,30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-26,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 21, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1, 6-26 and 30-31 are pending in this application for consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 6-26 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is indefinite and confusing in the recitation of "said parked position comprising a plate" because it is not clear how this plate is connected to the parked position and what would it perform.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "the device" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1746

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallet et al in view of Horridge and Luongo.

Hallet et al (EP-0958,849) disclose an apparatus for cleaning an installation (100) having at least one cleaning unit (201) configured to move within the installation (100) to be cleaned; flexible connection (206) configured to supply a cleaning agent to the cleaning unit and to move with a movement of the cleaning unit (201). The lamellar elements (105) of settler (100) are cleaned by compressed air (cleaning agent) from a row of nozzles (cleaning unit, 201) which pass beneath the lamellae. Nozzles are mounted on chariot which moves at a speed of 1-100 cm/sec. The cleaning unit is a conveyance system which move back and forth beneath the tubes and capable of carrying as a carriage on a guide system (202, 204). The cleaning unit is capable of parking in the installation. The flexible tube (206) is coiled on a roller (207) and connected to a cleaning source (208) for cleaning agent. Hallet et al discloses all the limitations as claimed herein except that a nozzle is configured to be driven in a rotational movement and parked position comprising a plate.

Horridge (6,402,854) disclose a nozzle (10) which is configured to be driven in a rotational movement to facilitate cleaning of all areas of the inside surface (see col. 2, lines 15-17).

Luongo (5,622,196) discloses drip pan 37 under a conveyor belt for collecting liquid (see Fig. 1 and Col. 3, lines 59-65).

It would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed apparatus to include a rotatable nozzle as disclosed by Horridge for the purpose of cleaning all the inside surfaces in one pass. Further, it is well known in the art of cleaning to use drip pan to prevent the cleaning liquid from spillage in the area or contaminated with other liquid as disclosed by Luongo. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a drip plate in the apparatus of Hallet et al to prevent the cleaning liquid being mixed with food stuff.

Claims 8, 10-11, 15, and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallet et al in view of Horridge and Luongo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Vowles.

Hallet were discussed supra. However, the reference fails to disclose driving gear being connected to the cleaning unit with a power transmission element, a roller connected to the driving gear.

Vowles (5,265,671) disclose an apparatus for cleaning a bore of a tube by projecting a flexible conduit. The apparatus comprising a drum (1), (roller) with deep spiral grooves (2) for accommodation of a lance. A shaft (9) is made coaxial with the drum extending from one of its ends through its axial length of the drum beyond its other end. Shaft (9) is rotatably supported in threaded bearing (17). Part of the shaft extending beyond the drum is made hollow to accommodate ducting, which is connected to the outer end of the shaft by suitable swivel means (20) (see col. 2, lines 31-65). Drive motor (14) is mounted upon the outer face of end plate with its output shaft connected to shaft (13). As the drum rotates, co-operation of screw thread (10) on shaft (9) and screwed boss (17) causes the drum to axially displaced at a rate which continuously

Art Unit: 1746

positions the point at which lance leaves deep spiral grooves of the drum adjacent the bore of fairlead (22) (see col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, lines 3).

It would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed apparatus to include a power transmission element a driving gear and roller drum as disclosed by Vowles into the apparatus of Hallet et al for the purpose of controlling the hose movement through the installation since with the movement of the drum would give better and efficient control of the hose. Hose made of plastic material would have been matter of choice since plastic hose is produced cheaper than the other materials. The shaft is rotatably supported in threaded screw bearing (17). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would include bearings which would move the roller in axial direction. The references did not disclose trapezoidal thread or multiplex trapezoidal thread. Vowles discloses to use screw thread (10) and screwed boss (17), which causes to axially displace the drum. One of ordinary skill in the art would replace a trapezoidal thread or multiplex trapezoidal thread with a screw thread since all would have given the same result and it is matter of choice to use one the thread. Further, one of ordinary skill in the art would positioned the driving gear outside of the installation as disclosed by Hallet to prevent corrosion on driving gear with cleaning agents. The references fails to disclose a guide rail. One of ordinary skill in the art would use a guide rail instead of a cable for guiding the cleaning unit since guide rail are well known in the art for guiding on a guide rail.

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallet et al in view of Horridge, Luongo and Vowles as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Smith.

Smith (5,402,809) discloses conveyor assembly 40 the assembly 40 is

Art Unit: 1746

seen to be formed of a continuous stainless steel chain 310 which is positioned in driven relationship about main sprocket 232, and which extends through entrance opening 66 and exit opening 68 to be wound about secondary sprocket (see col. 11, lines 31-35).

It would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed apparatus to include a stainless steel chain as disclosed by Smith into the apparatus of Hallet for the purpose of increased durability of the transmission element.

Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hallet et al in view of Horridge, Luongo and Vowles as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Niederer, Jr. et al.

Hallet et al were discussed supra. However, the reference fails to disclose a conveyor belt for transporting foodstuffs or pharmaceuticals.

Niederer, Jr. et al (3,155,102) discloses a conveyor belt for transporting and washing foodstuffs (see Figs. 1 and 2).

It is well known in the art to transport and clean foodstuffs on a conveyor belt as disclosed by Niederer, Jr. et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time applicant invented the claimed apparatus to combine nozzle mounted on chariot as disclosed by Hallet into the apparatus of Niederer, Jr. et al to clean the conveyor and the interior of the installation. The entry system for a refrigerating agent is an intended use of the apparatus, which has not give any weight for patentability.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argued that Hallet does not teach a parked position in the interior of the installation, much less a parked position configured so that the cleaning unit may be parked during production or processing of foodstuffs or pharmaceuticals.

This argument is not persuasive because the cleaning unit of Hallet may be parked within the settler during the processing and the claimed language does not structurally distinguished the parked position.

Applicant argued that Hallet teaches a cleaning device that is useful for cleaning only a small part, the lamellae, and not the inside surface of the settler. The presently claimed invention, on the other hand, relates to a device useful for cleaning essentially the whole inside surface of the installation.

This argument is not persuasive because Hallet apparatus is capable of cleaning all the surfaces inside of the settler. The applicant fail to explain, which part of the claimed apparatus is different than the Hallet et al apparatus.

The applicant argued that the present record includes no explanation of why one of skill in the art would be motivated to try to combine the two references. As explained above, Hallet is directed to cleaning lamellar elements, not inside surfaces.

This argument is unpersuasive because it is well known in the art to utilize a nozzle tip having a rotational movement by a flow of the cleaning fluid as disclosed by Horridge. One of ordinary skill in the art would substitute rotating nozzle with the stationary nozzle of Hallet to cover all the surfaces of the installation and lamellar element. By substituting the nozzle would not destroy the function, instead would increase the rotating nozzle effect by cleaning both the surrounding surfaces and the lamellar element.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6-26 and 30-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saeed T. Chaudhry whose telephone number is (571) 272-1298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 1746

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Barr, can be reached on (571)-272-1414. The fax phone number for non-final is (703)-872-9306.

When filing a FAX in Gp 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Saeed T. Chaudhry
Patent Examiner

MICHAEL BARR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Barr', is written over the printed name and title. The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping underline that extends to the left and then curves back under the name.